

Rutland County Herald.

VOLUME 54.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 23, 1848.

NUMBER 8.

RUTLAND COUNTY HERALD.

Published every Wednesday Evening at Rutland, Vt.
By GEO. H. BEAMAN.

TERMS.—PER YEAR
In Advance \$2.00
In Advance \$1.50
In Advance \$1.00
In Advance \$0.50
In Advance \$0.25
In Advance \$0.10
In Advance \$0.05
In Advance \$0.02
In Advance \$0.01

ADVERTISING
A single column of 10 lines for 1 week \$1.00
A single column of 10 lines for 2 weeks \$1.50
A single column of 10 lines for 3 weeks \$2.00
A single column of 10 lines for 4 weeks \$2.50
A single column of 10 lines for 5 weeks \$3.00
A single column of 10 lines for 6 weeks \$3.50
A single column of 10 lines for 7 weeks \$4.00
A single column of 10 lines for 8 weeks \$4.50
A single column of 10 lines for 9 weeks \$5.00
A single column of 10 lines for 10 weeks \$5.50

Original Poetry.

To the Memory of Ruth Kelly.

By Geo. H. Beaman.

O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,
O thou that art so young,

We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,
We meet thee in our circle,

Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,
Thy parents knew a sadness,

Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,
Oh! teach those pleasures left you,

We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,
We'll speak of the departed,

The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,
The morn of life is fleeting,

SPEECH OF MR. PALFREY.

ON THE POLITICAL ASPECT OF THE SLAVE QUESTION.

By Geo. H. Beaman.

The gentleman said: "The supposition that the States would exclude from all the territories of the United States an institution which prevailed so generally among them, seems improbable in itself, and those who maintain it may well be required to furnish the evidence. There is not, sir, in the whole Constitution, any one clause, which, either directly or indirectly, favors the idea that slavery was to be limited to the States where it then existed, or to be excluded from any part of the territory of the United States" (page 5.). I think Mr. Chairman, that the Constitution, had it been faithfully executed, according to the sense of the Convention, which framed it, and of the people who adopted it, contains enough safeguards against such a wrong, and that contained in its true meaning and spirit, it could never have been used to extend the benefits of the original compromise—compromises had enough, any way, to the free States—to new parties, not embraced in the original partnership. The gentleman seems, thinks otherwise, and, unfortunately, he has recent constructions in his favor. The parties have come and gone. We may have opportunity to look at the question further, when further usurpations, as I esteem them, shall be attempted upon the liberties which it was expected to secure to the freemen who ratified it. Enlightened by the dismal experience we have had, I own I could now wish that the Constitution had uttered more positive and explicit prohibitions, though I have little doubt that even they would have all avail against such unscrupulous influences as have been in action to nullify it in all cases in which slavery was concerned. But this is no further precautions were taken is no matter of surprise. The gentleman may read the debates of the Convention which framed that instrument, and of the State Conventions that ratified it, with very different eyes from mine; he does not see that the Statesman of that day expected that the disavowance of the slave trade, after 20 years, for which they made provision, and the disavowance of slavery, itself, would be pretty nearly simultaneous events. Such I think was the general expectation that prevailed everywhere, except in South Carolina and Georgia, which it must be owned, clung to the evil with a tenacious fondness. No, sir, the tree of the Constitution which our fathers planted, bore a natural fruit, salutary and palatable. A noxious branch was grafted upon it, which grew rankly, and overshadowed and poisoned the tree, a mildewed cat, blighting its whole frame. Prune that off, and again its beneficent abundance will yield fruit for the healing of the nation.

The gentleman said further, "The bill of the States have slaves, the other half have none" (page 5.), and from that statement he argued that in settling the institution of new territory an equitable arrangement would be to give half of it up to Slavery and let Liberty live in the rest. Sir, I do not agree to that fractional statement. If I were what I have presented to the attention of the Committee are examined, then it appears that not one half, but one-fifth part of the people of this Confederacy are interested as proprietors, in an institution which is essentially and irreconcilably hostile to the highest interest of the other four-fifths of the people, and which demands to be held all the power of the Government, and extend the borders of its own domain, for the purpose of sustaining and perpetuating that instrument for oppressing the great majority.

The gentleman said again, in connection with this topic, "It is obvious that by transferring part of the slaves from the old States to the new, you would not increase their numbers" (page 8.). Sir, if my little reasoning in political economy has not misled me, this is by no means obvious; but on the contrary it is obvious, that by removing a population from comparatively narrow bounds, you provide for an increase of its numbers, and particular considerations might be added in the present instance, to show further that result would follow. Anticipate the reply that may be made to this. It may be said, very well, increase the amount of human life, and you add to the sum of human happiness. But in the first place, this is a direct abandonment of the other position. And in the second, I will not allow that the sum of happiness, under all circumstances of social condition, is enlarged with that of life. Virginians, at least, are not apt to forget the saying of their great patriot, "Give liberty or give me death." If that sentiment be just, then it should equally be said, Give me liberty, or cease me not with existence.

Much of the interest manifested for the emancipation of the colored race, the gentleman referred to the action of Anti-Slavery or Abolition societies" (page 9.). He is aware that they are no institutions of recent origin, but coeval with the existence of our government. I hold in my hand a copy of a memorial addressed to the Congress of the United States in Feb. 1790, by the Pennsylvania Society for promoting the Abolition of Slavery. The name of no less considerable a person than the sage Benjamin Franklin is subscribed to that memorial as President. I think Dr. Franklin knew some things as well as the men of this more confident generation. I think particularly that he had some comprehension of that Constitution which he helped to frame and I set his authority against that of a Boston writer, who couldered disquisitionally whether the Abolition movement is reconcilable with duty under the Constitution. Among the illustrious names on the roll of that Society is found that of Lafayette, whom the gentleman from North Carolina quoted as complimenting "the good sense of the American people, which enabled them to lay aside all domestic differences"—the same Lafayette who said to Clarkson, as that philanthropist reports in a letter, written not long before his death, "I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America, if I could have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of slavery."

The gentleman from N. C. presented a classification of Abolitionists of the present day. I am not satisfied with it, either for precision or completeness, and will bespeak his patience while I propose a different.

There are, in the first place, the Abolitionists, strictly and commonly so called. Their specific distinction as a body, is that they urge a dissolution of the Federal Constitution, and of the Union. With the gentleman on the other side who expressed his sentiment not long ago, they held to the "sacred right of revolution." They attach to it a similar sanctity, though they would not prosecute the object in the way which I suppose he would think legitimate. They are generally at least, non-resistants, and most of them even refrain from using force in support of a Government which they regard as illegitimate in so much wrong with a late President of the College of South Carolina they have "calculated the value of the Union," and, as they do the sum, the Union turns out to cost too much. Among them are persons of the greatest purity of life, and the most unselfish philanthropy.

There are individuals of eminent abilities, of the highest culture, and of social consequence, the most esteemed. There are those who bear the great historical names of the North—names whose names exist testifies to a noble and noble period of New England without commensurate meeting.

I do not adopt their views in respect to the Union. I reject entirely the doctrine which makes the distinguishing badge of that body. It was from them that those expressions proceeded which the gentleman quoted to the Committee as having been recalled by Mr. Nathan Appleton. I regret that the Statesman of that day expected that the disavowance of the slave trade, after 20 years, for which they made provision, and the disavowance of slavery, itself, would be pretty nearly simultaneous events. Such I think was the general expectation that prevailed everywhere, except in South Carolina and Georgia, which it must be owned, clung to the evil with a tenacious fondness. No, sir, the tree of the Constitution which our fathers planted, bore a natural fruit, salutary and palatable. A noxious branch was grafted upon it, which grew rankly, and overshadowed and poisoned the tree, a mildewed cat, blighting its whole frame. Prune that off, and again its beneficent abundance will yield fruit for the healing of the nation.

The gentleman said further, "The bill of the States have slaves, the other half have none" (page 5.), and from that statement he argued that in settling the institution of new territory an equitable arrangement would be to give half of it up to Slavery and let Liberty live in the rest. Sir, I do not agree to that fractional statement. If I were what I have presented to the attention of the Committee are examined, then it appears that not one half, but one-fifth part of the people of this Confederacy are interested as proprietors, in an institution which is essentially and irreconcilably hostile to the highest interest of the other four-fifths of the people, and which demands to be held all the power of the Government, and extend the borders of its own domain, for the purpose of sustaining and perpetuating that instrument for oppressing the great majority.

The gentleman said again, in connection with this topic, "It is obvious that by transferring part of the slaves from the old States to the new, you would not increase their numbers" (page 8.). Sir, if my little reasoning in political economy has not misled me, this is by no means obvious; but on the contrary it is obvious, that by removing a population from comparatively narrow bounds, you provide for an increase of its numbers, and particular considerations might be added in the present instance, to show further that result would follow. Anticipate the reply that may be made to this. It may be said, very well, increase the amount of human life, and you add to the sum of human happiness. But in the first place, this is a direct abandonment of the other position. And in the second, I will not allow that the sum of happiness, under all circumstances of social condition, is enlarged with that of life. Virginians, at least, are not apt to forget the saying of their great patriot, "Give liberty or give me death." If that sentiment be just, then it should equally be said, Give me liberty, or cease me not with existence.

Much of the interest manifested for the emancipation of the colored race, the gentleman referred to the action of Anti-Slavery or Abolition societies" (page 9.). He is aware that they are no institutions of recent origin, but coeval with the existence of our government. I hold in my hand a copy of a memorial addressed to the Congress of the United States in Feb. 1790, by the Pennsylvania Society for promoting the Abolition of Slavery. The name of no less considerable a person than the sage Benjamin Franklin is subscribed to that memorial as President. I think Dr. Franklin knew some things as well as the men of this more confident generation. I think particularly that he had some comprehension of that Constitution which he helped to frame and I set his authority against that of a Boston writer, who couldered disquisitionally whether the Abolition movement is reconcilable with duty under the Constitution. Among the illustrious names on the roll of that Society is found that of Lafayette, whom the gentleman from North Carolina quoted as complimenting "the good sense of the American people, which enabled them to lay aside all domestic differences"—the same Lafayette who said to Clarkson, as that philanthropist reports in a letter, written not long before his death, "I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America, if I could have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of slavery."

The gentleman from N. C. presented a classification of Abolitionists of the present day. I am not satisfied with it, either for precision or completeness, and will bespeak his patience while I propose a different.

There are, in the first place, the Abolitionists, strictly and commonly so called. Their specific distinction as a body, is that they urge a dissolution of the Federal Constitution, and of the Union. With the gentleman on the other side who expressed his sentiment not long ago, they held to the "sacred right of revolution." They attach to it a similar sanctity, though they would not prosecute the object in the way which I suppose he would think legitimate. They are generally at least, non-resistants, and most of them even refrain from using force in support of a Government which they regard as illegitimate in so much wrong with a late President of the College of South Carolina they have "calculated the value of the Union," and, as they do the sum, the Union turns out to cost too much. Among them are persons of the greatest purity of life, and the most unselfish philanthropy.

There are individuals of eminent abilities, of the highest culture, and of social consequence, the most esteemed. There are those who bear the great historical names of the North—names whose names exist testifies to a noble and noble period of New England without commensurate meeting.

I do not adopt their views in respect to the Union. I reject entirely the doctrine which makes the distinguishing badge of that body. It was from them that those expressions proceeded which the gentleman quoted to the Committee as having been recalled by Mr. Nathan Appleton. I regret that the Statesman of that day expected that the disavowance of the slave trade, after 20 years, for which they made provision, and the disavowance of slavery, itself, would be pretty nearly simultaneous events. Such I think was the general expectation that prevailed everywhere, except in South Carolina and Georgia, which it must be owned, clung to the evil with a tenacious fondness. No, sir, the tree of the Constitution which our fathers planted, bore a natural fruit, salutary and palatable. A noxious branch was grafted upon it, which grew rankly, and overshadowed and poisoned the tree, a mildewed cat, blighting its whole frame. Prune that off, and again its beneficent abundance will yield fruit for the healing of the nation.

The gentleman said further, "The bill of the States have slaves, the other half have none" (page 5.), and from that statement he argued that in settling the institution of new territory an equitable arrangement would be to give half of it up to Slavery and let Liberty live in the rest. Sir, I do not agree to that fractional statement. If I were what I have presented to the attention of the Committee are examined, then it appears that not one half, but one-fifth part of the people of this Confederacy are interested as proprietors, in an institution which is essentially and irreconcilably hostile to the highest interest of the other four-fifths of the people, and which demands to be held all the power of the Government, and extend the borders of its own domain, for the purpose of sustaining and perpetuating that instrument for oppressing the great majority.

The gentleman said again, in connection with this topic, "It is obvious that by transferring part of the slaves from the old States to the new, you would not increase their numbers" (page 8.). Sir, if my little reasoning in political economy has not misled me, this is by no means obvious; but on the contrary it is obvious, that by removing a population from comparatively narrow bounds, you provide for an increase of its numbers, and particular considerations might be added in the present instance, to show further that result would follow. Anticipate the reply that may be made to this. It may be said, very well, increase the amount of human life, and you add to the sum of human happiness. But in the first place, this is a direct abandonment of the other position. And in the second, I will not allow that the sum of happiness, under all circumstances of social condition, is enlarged with that of life. Virginians, at least, are not apt to forget the saying of their great patriot, "Give liberty or give me death." If that sentiment be just, then it should equally be said, Give me liberty, or cease me not with existence.

publish a pamphlet in his defence." The gentleman read some of the extracts which he (Mr. Appleton) thought proper to make, to show the opinions of his assistants. And then, in allusion to part of what he had quoted, he went on to say, "this last sentiment he shows has been adopted as a motto by many who do not profess to belong to the sect of Abolitionists." The gentleman most pardon me. I think his friend has not shown this. I think that he has not ascertained it. If the gentleman understands that his friend has insinuated it, in relation to the writer of the pamphlet that drew out his own on that gentleman be the responsibility of that interpretation. I entertain no such question here.

And if the gentleman can further show that that insinuation is in fact made, then be the responsibility of such an insinuation upon its author. Certainly it would be a groundless one. The writer of the pamphlet which occasioned the publication by the gentleman's friend, recorded distinctly his dissent from the doctrine of Abolition. It was no *outrage dictum*, but explicitly set down, and somewhat fully reasoned out. In answer to the inquiry—What course of action the usurpations of Slavery demanded from the Free States, he said, "They should not mediate a severance of the Union of the States. Dissolution would be an evil thing as it is painted by any of those who, by dwelling exclusively on its evils, put their consciences to sleep in respect to that Slavery, which, as long as it exists, will threaten, more than all other causes together, to bring it about." He then proceeded to some considerations in confirmation of this sentiment, and concluded his remarks upon the topic by saying, "Constitutional proceedings, then, alone are to be thought of for the abatement of this monstrous nuisance. A dissolution of the States, on all other accounts a calamity, does not change its character, when viewed in relation to this end."

Another portion of those interested in the movement against Slavery, is embraced in the *Liberty Party* so called. It has a regular party organization, contemplating action under the Constitution, holding its Conventions, and supporting its own candidates for office, as much as either of the two parties that mainly divide the country. In some States its numbers are large. In my own State, its vote has nearly reached ten thousand. In New York, in 1844, it came up, I believe, to fifteen thousand.

Among the opponents of Slavery are next to be reckoned great numbers in the two principal parties in the Free States. A very large number—I suppose the dominant portion—of the Democracy of New York has lately taken strong ground upon the subject; and the same, though to a less extent, has been the current of Democratic opinion in New Hampshire, while the Whigs of New Hampshire have made themselves very distinctly heard, and a combination, on the ground of hostility to slavery, has placed the government of that State out of the hands of a dynasty which had seemed destined to be perpetual. In Massachusetts, we have fourteen counties. Two of them are small, their population not exceeding that of several of our single towns. The Whigs of a majority, I believe, of the rest of the county Conventions last autumn, declared the opposition of Mass to any candidate for the Presidency, or the Vice Presidency, who was not known to be opposed to the further extension of slavery, while no county, as far as I know, assumed the opposite ground. But the people of that other Commonwealth have lately taken the alarm, and they do not limit their views to the mere confinement of slavery within its present limits. Let me read, Mr. Chairman, a Resolve of the Legislature of the pattern Whig State of Massachusetts, passed, as appears by the certified copy which I hold in my hand, on the 27th day of February last, five days before the dissolution of the last Congress. It reads thus:

"Resolved unanimously, That the Legislature of Massachusetts view the existence of human slavery within the limits of the United States, as a great calamity, an immense moral and political evil, which ought to be abolished as soon as that end can be properly and constitutionally attained, and that its extension should be uniformly and earnestly opposed by all good and patriotic men throughout the Union."

Sir, that is plain language. That is off-hand, downright, point-blank utterance, and I know what such utterance is. Without being any friend to the doctrine of insurrection, I take that for the sentiment and counsel of my venerated mother, and may I not say that she will be accordingly? I stand on just that platform. I mean that I mean to stand on the sense of my native State and I hold that my sentiments are exactly up to it. With that record of the will of Whig Massachusetts in my hand, I shall not go to Mr. A. B. or C. in State street or Wall street, to learn whether I am a Whig, when measured by some second rate standard in their minds. Still less shall I go to have my Whig character proved upon by some inspecting editor here in Washington. I had not been many days in this place before one of that profession insinuated in me and to one of my friends as "partial excessiveness" upon the Whig party. It is perhaps not quite as direct language, but it proved the same sentence on the other Whig members, and recommended, I think, that we should be "toppled off." The calculation at the time was, that the party in this House had five majorities all told. It was a brilliant idea that "toppling off" which would have left a minority quietly behind. Sir, it would not have left a good working majority; it would not have been good partisan economy. It would have been financing too much the fact of the honest refusal in the English song—

"If I'm happy the soldier that lives on his pay,
And spends half as much more as I do."
The happy thought was ground out by what was said—of course erroneously—be the organ of a certain interest in this House. To judge from the music a dissonance, it was an instrument of malignant pretension, fitted with a sorry set of what Milton called

From the lumber garret, which was its too evident destiny it has lately, if report says true, been ransomed to be furnished with another stop, and attuned to a different symphony. I think it was time.

The Chairman's hammer fell, on the expiration of the hour, before the last paragraph was finished. Mr. P. would have gone on substantially as follows:

There is another large class of persons, who are apt to be left wholly out of the account in a consideration of this question—friends of freedom, who disclaimed to attach themselves to a third party, and merely block the wheels—sincerely dissatisfied with the Democratic party, because of its alliance with Slavery, and not sufficiently satisfied with the Whigs, because they think their practice is not up to their professions—stay at home, and do not vote at all, simply hoping and waiting for better times.

When the Democratic party in Massachusetts fully abandoned, in 1845, the opposition to the annexation of Texas, in which, up to that time, it had gone hand in hand with its rival, the effect was immediately seen at the autumn election, in the loss of seventeen thousand of its votes; very nearly one-third of the whole number. It fell off still further the following year; and although it recovered a few thousands at the last election of Governor, this gain has been thought to be owing, to some extent, to the accession of Whigs favorable to the war. There can scarcely be fewer than 100,000 votes in Massachusetts. The last year but one, the aggregate of votes scarcely exceeded 101,000, and the last year 105,000. In short, about one-third of the voters did not use their right. Of course, a variety of causes are to be supposed for this. A large number of voters always will be missing. But for so remarkable a result it is natural to presume that there was some prevailing reason, and I suppose there is no doubt that that to which I have alluded, was a very material operation.

Once more, there is a large and all-important class of enemies of Slavery beyond the borders of the Free States. In the Lexington District of Kentucky it is well known that there lives one of its foes, who bears a name to conjure with, and from the city of Louisville, a newspaper is sent abroad, within, and to the South and East of that State, devoted to the doctrine of Freedom, conducted with singular talent and right feeling, and exerting a sensible and extensive influence. A Governor of Virginia, not long ago, proposed to have the slaveholding enactment of a law giving to the respective counties the power to expel colored people beyond their limits. The non-slaveholding farmers, west of the Blue Ridge, thanked him for teaching them that word. They did not approve the public application recommended of this new principle in legislation, but already there is much speculation about a State law, authorizing the counties severally, to banish Slavery within their own borders. Deliberate seems on the verge of emancipation, and pausing for the nation's prosperity, it will bring. There are indications that Maryland will not be very far behind.

The instruction which her Representative does not think ought to be spoken of here, is discussed very freely in her dwellings and by her road sides. An unassuming under the hard to see as oppress freedom is working in Western North Carolina and Eastern Tennessee. In Georgia, if report says true, the causes of the depression of the white laboring man are engaging a constantly increasing attention, and there are whispers that the thing is whispered even among the *sensitives* of South Carolina. But whether more or less developed in one place or another, I take it to be unquestionable that a desire for emancipation prevails to an extent already not inconsiderable, among the non-slaveholding population of the Southern country. And it has a healthy root and main growth. They are coming to see that for the welfare of the whole and especially for their own, it is necessary that the nuisance be abated. Attention is getting fixed upon that great political truth—The *Liberal Political Aspect of the Slave Question* sounds into the light. Dissension of it may take place, and must inevitably in confirming, enlightening, and guiding to a practical issue, the sense of its reality and of the obligation to seek a remedy.

So that, as I view the case, this is by no means a geographical and sectional question as the gentleman from North Carolina understands it (page 11.) and as it is made to appear in the Resolutions of Mr. Calhoun, one great point of whose reciprocity is, to present different issues from the true ones. The question is not all between the North and South, but between the many millions of non-slaveholding Americans, North, South, East, and West, and the very few hundreds of thousands of their fellow citizens who are slaveholders. It is time that the idea of a geographical division of parties with reference to this subject, was abandoned. It has no substantial foundation—Freedom with its late reign of bondage, blessing for white and black—Slavery with its untold miseries for both—these are the two parties in the field, and, as their relative power, the *exclusiveness*, if collected, would be outnumbered by the population of the single city of New York, while the name of the other has a Legion. I cannot therefore attach any importance to the hint which the gentleman threw out, towards the close of his remarks, of

what "the South" might think it necessary to do, if the Anti-Slavery movement were too much pressed (page 16.). On this point he spoke forthrightly, and in a strain which contrasts most agreeably with language to which these walls have listened in some other times. I have something to say upon the subject, but I do not feel called upon to bring it forward till some further occasion shall arise. I will now only express my deliberate and undoubting conviction, that the time has quite gone by, when the friends of Slavery might hope anything from an attempt to move the South to disunion for its defence. When they raise that question seriously, their non-slaveholding neighbors—with their majority of more than six votes to one, even in that union—will settle it for them very quietly and effectually, through the ballot boxes. And it is altogether likely they will then go further yet, and say, "An evil which has all along annoyed, degraded, and kept us down and which now asks for its support the overthrow of our wise form of government, is no more to be tolerated. Our interests, our peace, our safety, demand its extinction." I do not believe it is good policy for the slaveholder to let their neighbors hear them talk of disunion. Unless I read very stupidly the signs of the times, it will not be the Union they will thus endanger, but the interest to which they would sacrifice it. If they insist that both cannot stand together, they may be taken at their word, but it is the Union that must stand.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.

That poor farm boy is at the present time at Washington a member of Congress from Mississippi. His name is Patrick W. Tompkins (the only white from the State). He is a self-made man, and history shows what a humble boy can do, when he determines to try.